IRSTI 03.09.25

Zhumagulov K.T.[1], Fabio L. Grassi[2]

[1]Doctor of Historical sciences, Professor, academician, Director of the Center on world history studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: kalkaman.zhumagulov@kaznu.kz

[2] Doctor of Historical sciences, Professor, Representative of the Rector in the Executive Board o f EURAS Roma State Sapienza University, Italy, e-mail: fabio.grassi@uniroma1.it

INTEGRATION OF THE EAST AND WEST IN THE HISTORY

In this article, an attempt was made to study the topical issue of integrating the East and West in a historical perspective. The authors consider important events in world history that influenced the relations between East and West. Especially the main attention is paid to the study of the role of the Huns in Turkic history as part of world history.

The Great Migration of peoples in IV-VII centuries was a turning point in world history. It was started by the Hun's tribal alliance and their movement from the depths of Central Asia to Europe. The greatest territorial expansion of the Hun Empire in the West was under the leadership of Attila. Attila was a great statesman who had done great actions. He was a wise ruler, a skilled diplomat, and a fair judge. With good reason he should be considered a prominent figure in the first millennium AD.

This paper has attempted to study Attila's major campaigns. We will focus on the intricate vicissitudes of the relationship between the Hunnic Empire and the Western Roman Empire, Italy at the time of Attila's invasion.

Being a person who headed the Great Migration in Eurasia and Europe, Attila has a prominent place not only in the history of the Orient, but also in the history of the Occident between the Antiquity and the middle Ages.

In this article, authors attempted to study the main campaigns of Attila. At the center of our attention will be the complex difficulties of the relationship between the Hunnish state and the Western Roman Empire, the Italy of the period of Attila's rule.

Research methods and the proof require the use of rare written sources in Latin, Greek languages. Data from archeology, ethnology, and history and modern linguistics interdisciplinary research is especially widely used.

Key words: East and West, the Great Migration; Huns; Attila; Roman Empire; civilization, Turkic history.

Жұмағұлов Қ.Т.[1], Фабио Грасси[2]

[1]тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, академик, Дүниежүзі тарихын зерделеу бойынша республикалық ғылыми-зерттеу орталығының директоры, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы, e-mail: kalkaman.zhumagulov@kaznu.kz

[2]тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, EURAS атқару комитетіндегі ректордың уәкілі, университет Ла-Сапиенза, Италия, Рим, e-mail: fabio.grassi@uniroma1.it

Тарихтағы Шығыс пен Батыстың интеграциясы

Бұл мақалада Шығыс пен Батыстың өзара байланыстарының өзекті мәселелері тарихи ракурсте қарастырылады. Авторлар Шығыс пен Батыстың арасындағы қарым-қатынастарға ықпал еткен маңызды оқиғаларды зерттейді. Әсіресе ғұндардың рөлі түркі әлемі ауқымында әлемдік тарихтың бөлігі ретінде талдануына ерекше мән беріледі.

IV-VII ғасырлардағы Ұлы қоныс аудару әлем тарихындағы маңызды оқиға болды, әсіресе нақты ғұн тайпалары одағының Орталық Азиядан Еуропаға жылжуы оған негіз болды. Батыстағы Ғұн империясы Аттиланың басқаруымен кең көлемді аумаққа және ерекше беделге ие болды. Аттила ұлы істерді атқарған мемлекеттік қайраткер, көреген билеуші, шебер дипломат және әділетті қазы еді. Ол шын мәнісінде І-ші мыңжылдықтың көрнекті тұлғасы деп есептеуге болады.

Бұл мақалада Аттиланың тұлғалық бейнесі мен жорықтарын талдауға ұмтылыс жасалынған. Авторлардың негізгі назарында Ғұн империясы мен Батыс Рим империясы, Аттила тұсындағы Италиямен өзара қарым-қатынастары болды.

Зерттеудегі негізгі әдістер мен әдебиетті пайдалануда латын, грек, епретгерман менскандинав тілдеріндегі жазбаша деректер басшылыққа алынған. Әсіресе археология, этнология, тарихи лингвистика мен қазіргі пәнаралық зерттеулер көп пайдаланылған.

Түйін сөздер. Шығыс пен Батыс, Ұлы қоныс аудару, ғұндар, Аттила, Рим империясы, Каталун шайқасы, түркі тарихы.

Жумагулов К.Т.[1], Фабио Грасси[2]

[1]доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик, директор Центра по изучению Всемирной истории, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, Алматы, e-mail: kalkaman.zhumagulov@kaznu.kz

[2]доктор исторических наук, профессор, представитель ректора в Исполнительном комитете EURAS, университет Ла-Сапиенза, Италия, Рим, e-mail: fabio.grassi@uniroma1.it

Интеграция Востока и Запада в истории

В этой статье была предпринята попытка изучения актуальных вопрос интеграции Востока и Запада в историческом ракурсе. Авторы рассматривают важные события в мировой истории, которые оказали влияние на отношения между Востоком и Западом. Особенно главное внимание уделяется изучению роли гуннов в тюркской истории как части мировой истории.

Великое переселение народов IV-VII вв. явилось переломным этапом во всемирной истории, начало которому положил именно гуннский союз племен своим продвижением из глубин Центральной Азии в Европу. Наибольшего территориального расширения и наибольшей мощи Гуннская держава на Западе достигла под предводительством Аттилы. Аттила был крупным государственным деятелем, совершившим великие деяния, мудрым правителем, искусным дипломатом и справедливым судьёй. С полным основанием его следует считать наиболее выдающейся личностью I тысячелетия.

В данной статье была предпринята попытка изучения личности и походов Аттилы. В центре нашего внимания будут находиться сложные перипетии взаимоотношений Гуннской державы и Западно-Римской империи, Италии периода правления Аттилы.

Методы исследования и доказательства заключаются в использовании редчайших письменных источников на латинском, греческом, раннегерманских, скандинавских языках. Особенно широко привлекаются данные археологии, этнологии, исторической лигнвистики и современных междисциплинарных исследований.

Ключевые слова: Восток и Запад, Великое переселение народов, гунны, Аттила, Римская империя, Каталаунская битва, тюркская история.

Introduction

Subjects of our report are: the ancient relation between the territories of nowadays Kazakhstan – the core of Asia Maior – and Europe; and what – in our humble opinion – Kazakhstan can and must be for European culture now. All these issues considered in historical aspect especially paying an attention to the roe of Huns.

For European explorers, travelers, merchants, the earth of Central Asia was *par excellence* the land of the great spaces and of the great adventure. In his capital book on Aesthetics, the great German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) wrote that Chinese civilization, contrarily to Ancient Hellenic civilization and Early Middle Age Europe civilization, had not got and could not have got a great epic literature because State had born in China too early and State tradition had never faded. So, due to the pre-eminence of agriculture, the European explorers, travelers, merchants once arrived in China found something familiar. Central Asia has always the land of great civilizations, nonetheless was more the land of the horse than the land of the plough. Therefore Central Asia did see great States, fine social buildings, but also travel, adventure, a mobile crucible of peoples, unforgettable epos. The Silk Road (actually several Silk Roads, whose some passed by nowadays Kazakhstan) was a matter of trade but also a matter of knowledge, of material and spiritual adventure.

Main part

Despite the well-known adventure of Alexander the Great of Macedonia, Ancient Romans had quite vague ideas on the world east of the great Parthian Empire. The Roman historian Florus describes

the visit of numerous envoys, including «Seres» (probably people coming from Central Asia), to the first Roman Emperor Augustus, who reigned between 27 BCE and 14 CE.

Important contacts occurred between the Vth and the VIIIth century, when Turkic populations like the Huns and the Avars made important expeditions and established realms in Central and Eastern Europe. They participated to that great general movement of communities that forged the Europe as we think it now.

In 568 the Sky Turks, who ruled the better part of the nowadays Kazakhstan, sent an embassy to Constantinople to form an alliance with the Byzantines and commence the silk trade directly with them, bypassing the Persian middlemen. The offer was accepted by emperor Justin II and in August 568 the general Zemarchus left Byzantium for Sogdiana. The embassy, whose description is preserved by Menander Protector, was under the guidance of Maniakh, chief of the people of Sogdiana. After several ceremonies the envoys proceeded to a hollow encompassed by the Golden Mountain, apparently in some locality of the Altay Mountains. They found the khan surrounded by astonishing pomp – gilded thrones, golden peacocks, gold and silver plate and silver animals, hangings and clothing of figured silk. They accompanied him some way on his march against Persia, passing through Talas or Turkestan in the S yr Daria valley. Zemarchus was present at a banquet in Talas where the Turkish khan and the Persian envoy exchanged abuse; but the Byzantine does not seem to have witnessed actual fighting. Near the river Okh (possibly Syr Darya) he was sent back to Constantinople with a Turkish embassy and with envoys from various tribes subject to the Turks. For several years this Turkish-Bizanthine alliance subsisted, encouraging close intercourse: when another Roman envoy, one Valentinos, went on his embassy in 575, he took back with him 106 Turks who had been visiting Byzantine lands.

The IV-VII centuries went down in the history of Eurasia and Europe as the era of the Great Migration. These four centuries experienced a peak of migration that swept almost the entire continent and changed its political, ethnic and cultural character radically. This was the period of death of ancient foundations and orders and the time of formation of new social relations and a new civilization – that of the Middle Ages.

Today, it is of particular importance to single out the Great Migration as a transitional historical period. It allows not only study of the specific history of the Great Migration, but also opens some opportunities to study the history of traditional views of the Great Migrations. At the turn of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages, not only did tribes and nations started to migrate, but also, so to speak, knowledge and understanding of the various tribes and peoples 'came to life' and intensified. The Great Migration, which was initiated by the Huns' tribal union, starting from the depths of Central Asia to the west of the European continent, became a turning point in world history. Since that time, the social relations, cultures and traditions of the tribes and peoples who inhabited the Eurasian space have become synthesized and integrated. This was an epochal event, common to all the countries of Europe and Asia. Therefore, we have compelling reasons to date the beginning of medieval history on a global basis, including the history of Kazakhstan, from the second half of the fourth century (375 AD) – the turning point of the Great Migration in Eurasia. This is related primarily to the history of the Huns, which is an integral part of Turkish history, and therefore the history of Kazakhstan.

Migration of Hun tribes and its role in the Great Migration

The resettlement and migration in Europe had taken place even before the Huns. The Germans were the first to be written about. The earliest ancient sources on the middle and northern European regions are pieces of information by Pytheas of Massalia (4th century BC), a Greek author and follower of Aristotle. Pytheas was the first to stress distinguishing features of the Celts and Scythians (Skythen) and to give evidence of the lands and their inhabitants, who later were called the Germans (Pytheas von Marseille, 1959).

South Scandinavia, Denmark and the German area of the North and Baltic Seas were the ancestral home of the tribes who later identified themselves as the 'Germans'. In the fifth century BC, they moved towards the south as far as the Harz and Hall, where the Germans faced with the Celts (Zhumagulov, 2002: 54).

Then, from the beginning of AD, the Germans tribal unions were in constant movement and confrontations with the Roman Empire. The apogee of the Great Migration was the Huns' travels from the east the Eurasian continent to its west. The Huns (Hunnoi) had inhabited Central Asia since ancient times. They belonged to the Turkic tribes. As far back as the fourth century BC, the Chinese called the Huns their most serious enemies, because the

Hun chieftains had made real progress in the wars against the Han Empire.

In the first centuries of A.D., the Hun tribes migrated actively and they also travelled from the territory of modern Kazakhstan and other regions of Central Asia to the West. In the middle of the fourth century BC, the Huns invaded the land between the Volga and the Don, having conquered the Alans in the Northern Caucasus, brought to heel the Kingdom of Bosporus, crossed the Don and broken the neck of the multitribal power of Ermanaric, the king of the Ostrogoths in South-Eastern Europe (in the year 375). That year was the beginning of a series of movements that led to the Great Migrations in Eurasia and Europe. In 376 AD, the Visigoths, narrowed by the Huns, crossed the Danube, and, with the permission of the Roman government, settled within the Roman province of Moesia with an obligation of military service and obedience. After that, the Huns attacked the Balkan provinces of the Eastern Roman Empire repeatedly.

Attila ruled from 434 to 453, and in his reign the Hun Empire reached its greatest strength and territorial expansion in the West. Greek and Latin sources indicate that Attila was from a royal lineage, which had ruled the Huns for generations.

At that time, the territory of the Hunnic Empire stretched from east to west, from the Altai Mountains, Central Asia and the Caucasus to the Danube and the Rhine. The Huns' tribal union in Central Asia contributed to the later formation of the Kazakh ethnic group and other Turkic peoples.

Rare sources are papal correspondence, chronicles, stories and notes of travelers, missionaries and other narrative evidences, containing valuable information on the history of the Huns, Turkic Khanate, Dasht-i- Kipchak, Golden Horde, the integration of East and West on the Silk Road.

All of these materials, we found in the collection of manuscripts in the hall of manuscripts Vaticani Latini (Latin collection). For example, regarding the Turks of the Huns and their relationship with the Roman Empire there is evidence in the writings of Pope Leo I the Great (440-461). He summoned the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) to the joint fight against the Huns in opposition to hegemony in Europe. In a letter dated April 23, 451 Pontiff wrote: «nam inter principes Christianos spiritu dei confirmante concordiam gemina per totum mundum fiducia roboratur, quia profectus caritatis et fidei utrorumque armorum potentiam insuperabilcm Facit, ut propitiato per unam confcssionem deo simul et haetretica falsitae et barbara destruatur hostilitas ...» (Biblioteca Apostólica Vaticana (BAV), Vaticani Latini).

The Battle of the Catalaunian Fields as the largest battle in world history

In April 451, the Gaul cities of Metz, Tongeren, Speyer, and Reims were all aflame. Paris was in a blue funk. The inhabitants of ancient Lutetia were about to flee away. A legend explains the salvation of the city by the extraordinarily brave behavior of a woman, St. Genovea, who later became known as the patron saint of Paris. From the 'Life of St. Genovea' we learn: 'At that time, Attila, the king of the Huns, began to ravage the provinces of Gaul. Parisians were frightened of his cruelty and anger, so they decided to send women and children and some belongings to a safe place. There St. Genovea turned up and she resolved to persuade women not to leave the city, in which they had been born and grown up, in the hour of danger and, moreover, to prepare themselves and their men to the defense. St. Genovea told the women to ask God for help and salvation. They listened to Genovea and decided to stay in the city and rely on God's mercy' (Vita St. Genovefae, 1910).

But Attila did not reach Paris. Having approached to Orleans on the left flank, the Huns began to assault it. It should be noted that the city was secured with stone bridges over the Loire and high defensive towers. How could Orleans withstand the onslaught of such a formidable foe? The Roman army and the forces of the Visigothic Kingdom arrived in time to help the besieged of Orleans. This, of course, hindered the Huns in capturing the city. Attila may have raised the siege because he doubted whether they would be able to force Orleans quickly, or he may have turned to the Oracle, because the Hun soothsayers had advised him not to continue the siege. Perhaps Attila was seeking a more convenient open space to fight... And so the Catalaunian Fields (Latin Campi Catalaunici) in Champagne (France) became the place for the decisive (major) battle. This area has its origin from Catuvellauner, the name of a Celtic tribe, and it is a plain between Troyes and present-day Châlon-sur-Marne.

After a victorious march by the Huns through the territory of Northern Gaul, i.e. France, there was a decisive battle on the Catalaunian Fields in Champagne in 451. I rate the battle among the largest ones, since along with the Battle of Cannes (216 BC) gained by Hannibal and that of Waterloo (1815), the last great battle of Napoleon, it ranks

among the most famous battles in the European and world history (Zhumagulov, 2011: 15).

The parties met on the Catalaunian Fields. Jordanes, the chronicler of the Goths, wrote, 'The place was shelving; it looked heaved having a hill crest. Both armies sought to occupy it, because the convenient terrain would have delivered considerable benefits; so the right side was occupied by the Huns with all their men [allies] and the left one was manned by the Romans and Visigoths with detached units. And they engaged in combat on the hill to possess the top'. The struggle for the commanding point was going with varying degrees of success. Aetius, well acquainted with the battle tactics of the steppe-warriors, seemed to be able to repel another attack by the advancing Huns. This had not been Attila's experience and he decided to strengthen his army with speeches at a most seasonable time. Being inspired by his words, everybody rushed into the fight. Attila himself directed the battle. In an instant, everything had become confused: battle-cries, the glance of cavalry swords and the dust that rose after the rushing riders. The warriors were fighting hand to hand: the battle was fierce, hit-and-miss, brutal, last-ditch (Jordanes, 1882: 1).

However, Attila decided to return to Pannonia, the centre of the Hunnic Empire. He decided to take a break in the battle against the united army of Europe and to conduct a movement. The army slowly turned to the Rhine. Attila and his army returned to Pannonia through Thuringia and Hungary, and no one pursued them.

We have made an attempt to reconstruct the events of Attila's Campaign in Gaul from extant written sources: the writings of Roman, Byzantine and early medieval authors. Describing the Huns in general, the latter made some exaggerations and inaccuracies, endowing them with the traditional features of so-called savage barbarians. Thus, Jordanes wrote: 'This savage race, according to the historian Priscus, having settled on the far bank of the lake of Meotia, knew no other business than hunting, except for the fact that when they grew up to the size of a tribe, they began hatter the calm of neighboring tribes by perfidy and looting' (quoram natio saeva, ut Priscus istoricus refert, Meotida palude ulteriore ripa insidens, venationi tantum nec alio labore experta, nisi quod, postquam crevisset in populis, et rapinis vicinarum gentium quiete conturbans).

When evaluating the largest battle under consideration, a number of Western scholars of modern and contemporary history, who had obtained information from the chroniclers of the early Middle Ages, used it uncritically. This approach always makes it difficult to assess the historical reality objectively. According to A. Pirenn, a Belgian historian, in the spring of 451, Attila crossed the Rhine and devastated all the areas as far as the Loire. 'Aetius stopped him [Attila – K.Zh.] with the help of the Germans near Troyes. The Franks, the Burgundians, the Visigoths and others showed themselves as good allies; the military art of the Romans and the Germans' bravery decided everything here ... Attila's death in 453 resulted in the collapse of his empire and thereby saved the West ...' (Pirenne, 1963: 29).

In our opinion, the situation in Gaul can be explained by the over-large scale of Attila's campaigns and the inability to restrain dozens of tribes and entities that were not related to the Huns socially and ethnically within the vast territory under the unified leadership. Indeed, the forces of the Huns were by no means exhausted after 'the Battle of the Nations' in 451 (Fehr H., Rummel Ph., 2011: 88-90). The fact that the next year Attila launched a new campaign to the heart of the Roman Empire, Italy, gives evidence of this.

Attila's campaigns against Italy

In the spring of 452 AD, a few months after the Battle of Catalaunian Fields, Attila the Hun gathered effective forces and began to organize a new campaign to Italy, the heart of the Roman Empire. Apparently it was the achievement of the Byzantine diplomacy that managed to send Attila against the West through complex intrigues, and thereby averted the impending threat.

During that campaign, the Hun army captured Aquileia, Concordia, Altin, Patavy (now Padua), Vinsentia (now Vicenza), Verona, Brixia (now Brescia), Bergamo, Milan, and Ticinus (now Pavia). Those cities that showed resistance were ruined; some of them preferred to surrender, giving under the onslaught of the Huns.

After the Huns had occupied Northern Italy, it did not take them much time to reach Rome. It was plain that the Western Empire did not have a force capable of stopping the onslaught of the menacing invaders, and Attila was close to world domination. His empire consisted of four parts, stretching from so-called Scythia (the kingdom of the Huns) to Germany (Scythica et Germanica regna) on the northern borders. In the South, both the Roman Empires (the Eastern and the Western) paid tribute to Attila. On a scale of territory and influence, the Empire of Attila geographically covered almost four parts of the world: from east to west and from north to south (the

ancient Turkic: tört bulun, the Kazakh 'dүnieniң tөrt bұryshy').

But how was the dramatic situation developing in Italy, where Attila and victorious army were staying? This situation was difficult for the Western Roman Empire, but Valentinian III was in Ravenna, sitting out and anxiously watching the development of affairs. As for the commander Aetius, he was also confused. The army of Rome could no longer resist the onslaught of the Huns, as it had been paralyzed by their successes in Northern Italy.

In the end, it was decided to use a way that had been well proven by the Eastern Romanians (Byzantine): they delegated an embassy to the court of Attila. It was headed by Pope St. Leo I, later named the Great; Consul Gennadius Avienus and urban prefect of Rome Trygetius also participated in the mission. A contemporary of those days, Prosper Tiro, wrote: 'et tot nobilium provinciarum lattissima eversione credita est saevilia et cupiditas hostilis explenda, mhilque inter omnia consilia principis ac senatns populique Romani salubrius visum est, quam ut per legates pax truculentissimi regis expeteretur, Suscepit hoc negotim cum vim consulari Avieno et viro praefectorio Trygetio beatissimus papa Leo auxilio dei fretus, quem scirel numquam piorum laboribus defuisse. nee aliud secutum est quam praesumpserat fides, nam tota leganione dignanter accepts ita summi sacerdotis praesentia rex gavisus est, ut bello abstinerc praeciperet et ultra Danuvium promissa pace discederet' (and severe damage to a number of provinces, accompanied by cruelty and greed of the enemy, left only the hope that the government, the Senate and the Roman people would find it the best way out to sue the ruthless king for peace via the embassy. This task was assigned to ex-Consul Avienus and urban ex-prefect Trygetius, and blessed Pope Leo pinned all his hopes on god, who, he knew, would not leave His people in the lurch. The entire embassy was received with respect, the king was particularly pleased with the presence of the highest head of the church, and he gave up the idea of continuing the war, promising to keep the peace and withdraw to the other side of the Danube) (Prosper Tiro, 1892: 482).

The meeting took place on the Ager Ambuleius, in the middle reaches the Mincius (now Mincio): 'igitur dum eius animus ancipiti neaotio inter ire et non ire fluctuaret secumque deliberans tardaret, placida ei legatio a Roma advenit. Nam Leo papa per se ad eum accedens in agroVenetum Arabuleio, ubi Mincius amnis commeantium frequentatione tmnsitur. qui mox deposuit exercitatu furore et rediens, quo venerat, iter ultra Danubium promissa pace discessit' ('While Attila was in two minds whether he should launch the dangerous operation, chewing upon it, dallying, the embassy from Rome arrived to offer an olive branch. Pope Leo I himself came to Attila who was on the Ager Ambuleius in the province of Veneto, where the Mincius River was crossed by the crowds of travelers. Then, Attila stopped the riot of his troops, and turning in the direction he had come from; he set off beyond the Danube, promising to keep the peace' (Jordanes, 1882:225).

Analyzing the rare sources available in the archives and collections in Europe, we do not find a detailed description of the mission to the court of Attila made by Leo I, which, incidentally, raised the authority and the prestige of the Pope objectively high, because he was able to influence the ruler of the peoples of East and West at such a formidable time for the Roman Empire. After that, Pope Leo I was named the Great.

And if Attila, who was standing near the walls of Rome, was stopped by the Pope, the same cannot be said about Geiserich, the king of the Vandals, another actor of that time. Three years later, in 455, Pope Leo I could not hold him. The Vandals looted and destroyed the city, and robbed its population blind; it brought the term 'vandalism' – the mass destruction of cultural and material values, brutality and senseless cruelty – into use. After a fourteen days' plunder of Rome, Geiserich and his army left the city. There is evidence that the king of the Vandals brought out thousands of Roman artisans as prisoners. According to Procopius of Caesarea, Geiserich 'having loaded his ships with huge amounts of gold and other royal treasures and having taken the copper items and everything else from the palace, sailed to Carthage. He robbed the temple of Jupiter Capitoline and took half of its roof off. That roof was made of the best copper and covered with a thick layer of gold, representing a majestic and amazing sight. They say one of Geiserich's ships that had been load with statues was lost, but all the rest of the ships of the Vandals sailed into the harbour of Carthage safe and sound'(Procopius Caesariensis, 1962: 4-6).

The fact that the ruler of the great Hunnic Empire, whose tributaries were both the Roman Empires, stopped before the city of Rome, throwing out a white flag, and took up the appeal of the embassy headed by the Pope, says much about Attila's wisdom. He stopped the riot of his army, preventing wanton destruction and casualties. In this case, Attila differs favorably from Geiserich, the king of the Vandals, or Alaric, the king of the Visigoths, despite the fact that some church legends tagged him the 'Scourge of God'.

But let us return to the momentous meeting of 452 AD. Reading the papal correspondence of those years, we came across a letter of 512 or 513, which the bishops of the eastern regions addressed to Pope Symmachus (498-514). Its content reveals that Pope St Leo I also spoke with Attila about releasing the prisoners who had been captured by the Huns (Patrologia Latina, 1865: 59-60).

Russian historiographers, including those of the Soviet period, barely covered the history of the Huns in Europe apart from a few references. They had a negative attitude to the history of religion. For example, in the book summarizing the degeneration of the Western Roman Empire and the emergence of the Germanic kingdoms, the Soviet medievalist A.R. Korsunskyi and the historian R. Gunther from the GDR confined themselves to one or two sentences: 'but the situation in Italy proved to be dangerous to the Huns themselves, as the country suffered from famine and an epidemic had began. This facilitated a dialog between the Roman embassy headed by Pope Leo I to negotiate with the Huns' (Korsunskii A., Gunter R., 1984: 115).

Continuing the analysis of the meeting of Attila and Pope St. Leo I on the Ager Ambuleius, we should note that the authority of the church and the papacy began rising straight afterwards. This meeting was of objectively great importance for the history of the papacy, and for medieval Europe as a whole, in terms of the growth of the political influence of the Popes and clergy throughout the Middle Ages and in subsequent history. The papacy gradually became an active force capable of administering secular affairs across Europe (Kurze Biographien, 2005: 3).

This point of view should prevail in considering, for example, the activities of the Popes towards the Kingdom of the Lombards in Italy in the middle of the eighth century, i.e. as the logical end of the active policy, which was launched in 452 AD. In 756 AD, Pope Stephen II, supported by the Frankish kingdom, was able to get rid of the Lombards and found a secular state in Central Italy. This was follow-on to the sanction that Pope Zachary gave to Pepin the Short, the major domo of the Franks a little earlier, to be conferred with a royal title and to depose the Merovingian dynasty.

We could cite other examples from the history of the Middle Ages: for example, the meeting of Pope Leo III and Charlemagne-to-be in Paderborn (Germany) in 799. This was the meeting after which Pope Leo III crowned the Frankish king with the crown of the Roman Emperors in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome. The fight of the German kings and the papacy for investiture, etc. is also worth mentioning.

Returning to the said meeting on the Ager Ambuleius in 452 AD, we can recall a fact of the modern history of Europe of the XIX century, when, after the Battle of Solferino in 1859, Napoleon III invited Emperor Franz Joseph I of Austria to conduct negotiations. The negotiations took place 5 km away from the historical place where, 1,400 years before, Pope Leo I carried out his mission at the court of Attila. Around there, people are still talking about the meeting between the Pope and the King of the Huns.

The above allows us to say that the Huns, who worshiped celestial bodies, practiced Tengriism and showed tolerance towards the religious beliefs of the conquered peoples. Among his contemporary warriors undertaking marches on Rome, Attila stood out. He showed respect for the Christian religion and the Pope. It is no coincidence that the images of the great ruler of the Hunnic Empire can be seen in the main Catholic Church, St. Peter's Basilica, in Rome.

Having returned to Pannonia, the ruler of the Hunnic Empire started preparing a new military campaign, but this time against the Eastern Roman Empire.

The King of the Huns spent the last months of his life preparing a campaign against the East. But a new war on the Byzantine Empire was not destined to break out. In the spring of 453 AD, Attila, the ruler of the Hunnic Empire, died.

Conclusion

Thus, we have analyzed the events of 451 – 452 AD. Both European wars waged by the Huns evidence the military power of the Hunnic Empire. If, in 451, the Western Roman Empire united almost the whole of the West against the Huns, then a few months later (less than a year) it could not resist their invasion into the heart of the Empire. The fact that the ruler of the huge state of the Huns, who had both the Roman Empires as tributaries, stopped before the city of Rome, because he had listened to requests of the embassy headed by the Pope, speaks for Attila's wisdom. He stopped the rampage of his troops, preventing senseless destruction and sacrifices. Here Attila compares favourably with Geiserich, King of the Vandals, or Alaric the Visigoth.

During the age-long existence (the 4th – 5th centuries) in Europe, in the turbulent era of the Great Migration, the Hunnic Empire was centered in Pannonia (in the territory that later became Hungary, Austria and parts of Yugoslavia) and objectively

had an impact on the fate of European history. In addition to wars and migrations, that historical epoch showed multifaceted interaction between the East and the West, synthesis and integration of traditions and cultures.

The Hunnic invasions of the middle of the fifth century – 451-452 AD – undermined the Western Roman Empire all the more, bringing about its decline. This was going to happen very soon, namely in 476 AD, when Romulus Augustulus, the last Western Roman Emperor, was deposed by Odoacer, the leader of German mercenaries and the son of Edeko (Edikon), who at one time held a high position under Attila.

Therefore, we have compelling reasons to date the beginning of medieval history on a global basis, including the history of Kazakhstan, from the second half of the fourth century (375 AD) – the turning point of the Great Migration in Eurasia. Such an approach to the question of the end of the history of antiquity and the beginning of medieval history has been presented, in particular, in a number of publications of professor Zhumagulov in Kazakhstan and abroad. And it was included in the sample syllabus on the history of the Middle Ages, developed and published by the Department of World History, Historiography and Source Studies of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University for all the humanities specialties of the universities of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The syllabus has been approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The problems of the history of the Huns are still waiting to be studied. Based on a thorough analysis of the sources, we have a need to open an objective picture of historical reality.

With the Islamization and Turkification o f the better part of Central Asia, the ancestors of modern Kazakh people gained a better knowledge of the Land of Rum, i.e. the survived Eastern part of the Roman Empire, i.e. Bizanthine Empire. No w the Turkic peoples looked mainly Westwards, to Mecca if not to Costantinople, also those Turkic peoples that had not left their motherland, the Greater Asia.

In the Early Middle Age, and especially in the first centuries of Islam, a precious role of intermediation had the Radhanites, Jewish merchants. The activities of the Radhanites are documented by Ibn Khordadbeh, the Director of Posts and Police for the province of Jibal under the Abbasid Caliph al-Mu'tamid, who ruled from 869 to 885, when he wrote *Kitab al-Masalik wal-Mamalik* (*Book of Roads and Kingdoms*), probably around 870. Ibn Khordadbeh described the Radhanites as sophisticated and multilingual. He outlined four main trade routes utilized by the Radhanites in their journeys; all four began in the Rhone Valley in Southern France and terminated on the east coast of China. Radhanites primarily carried commodities that combined small bulk and high demand, inclu ding spices, perfumes, jewellery, and silk. They are also described as transporting oils, incense, steel we apons, furs, and slaves.

13th Century is the Century of the great Mongolian Empire, of the Pax Mongolica, of the zenith of importance of the Silk Road (actually Silk Roads, we said) and of the first peak of the great economical, demographical and cultural reprise of Europe, a reprise started in 11th Century and only temporarily stopped in the middle 14th Century due to the terrible Black Death, the great pandemy that travelled, alas, along the same Silk Road that had brought so many goods and knowledge. Before this calamity, in the 2nd half of 13th Century the Polo family had repeatedly travelled between Venice and China and the younger Marco had later left, with the intermediation of the Pisan Rustichello, the souvenir of his experiences. Once more the territories of modern Kazakhstan were recorded in European culture as a fascinating land, where, in a geographical environment so different from the one of the little Europe, brave and wise lords knew how to rule peoples, economies, religions.

With the Ottoman conquest of Costantinople, the great Geographical discoveries and the consequent radical changes in trade and economy, a decrease of interest towards Central Asia occurred in Europe. Tamerlan was still a well-known figure in European popular culture, but the advent of the great, long-living Khazak Khanate, the birth and the glory of a State clearly referred to a people rather than to a dynasty, were not subject of sufficient interest and study. Long time later European diplomacies will follow carefully Russian expansion in Central Asia and the consequent Great Game with the British Empire, but still with limited resonance in popular European culture.

And so, one of the duties of contemporary European culture is to acquire and transmit a deeper knowledge of post-Tamerlan Central Asia and in particular of the glorious history of Khanate of Kazakhstan so to understand, to learn and to teach nowadays Kazakhstan, a growing country with a glorious past, a country having with Europe growing relationship.

In an age where independent Kazakhstan, under the wise and philosophically inspired leadership of his President, scores so great a development

and so great achievements in so many crucial fields, from economy to culture; in an age where independent Kazakhstan, in a World troubled by religious and political fanaticisms, prompts and accomplishes peaceful coexistence of identities and creeds, Europe must be sensitive to the intense call of Kazakhstan for intellectual cooperation and must look at Kazakhstan with utmost interest.

References

Biblioteca Apostólica Vaticana (BAV), Vaticani Latini (Vat. Lat. 541, f. 67-68 R). See also: BAV, Vat. lat. 1319, f. 96v, Vat. lat. 544, f. 183-184R

Fehr H. and Rummel Ph. (2011). Die Völkerwanderung. Stuttgart, Theiss Verl.

Jordanes (1882). Getica, 196-208. MGH Auctores Antiquissimi. Ed. Th. Mommsen. Berolini, Weidmannos, T. V.

Korsunskii A., Gunter R. (1984). Upadok y gibel Zapadnoy Rymskoy ymperyi y vozniknovenye germaskikh korolevstv do seredyny VI v. Moskwa: Izdatelstvo MGU. 256 s.

Kurze Biographien – Alle Päpste. Von Petrus bis Benedikt XVI (2005). Lozzi Roma, pp. 3,13.

Patrologia Latina (1865). Ed. J-P. Migne. Paris.

Pirenne H. (1963). Mahomet und Karl der Grosse. (Untergang der Antike am Mittelmeer und Aufstieg des germanischen Mittelalters). Frankfurt-Main-Hamburg.

Procopius Caesariensis (1962-1965). *Opera omnia*. Ed. J. Haury, G. Wirth. Leipzig, BV De bello Vandalico, I,V.

Prosper Tiro (1892). Epitoma de Chronicon, 1364/ – In: Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH)/ Auctores Antiquissmi, t. IX, Chronica minora, Vol. I. Ed. T. Mommsen, Berolini, p. 482.

Pytheas von Marseille (1959). Über das Weltmeer. / Die Fragmente/. Übers und erl. von D. Stichtenoth. Köln-Gray.

Zhumagulov K. (2002). Problemy istorii germanskih plemen (s drevnejshih vremen do nachala srednih vekov. Almaty. 365 s. [in Russian]

Zhumagulov K. (2011). Katalaunskaya bitva. Otan tarikhy. Nauchnyi zhurnal NAN RK, – Almaty, 2011, №2 (54), ss. 11-24.

Vita St. Genovefae (1910). Ed. C. Ku